

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 511

HE 020 745

AUTHOR Marting, Janet
TITLE An Historical Overview of the Training of Teaching Assistants.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 19p.; Paper identified by the Task Force on Establishing a National Clearinghouse of Materials Developed for Teaching Assistant (TA) Training.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College English; *College Faculty; *Educational History; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Professional Development; *Teacher Education; Teaching (Occupation); *Teaching Assistants
IDENTIFIERS *Teaching Assistant Training Project

ABSTRACT

The way that the issue of teacher training has been viewed over the past 60 years is traced. The need for professional training for prospective teachers was voiced in 1930 by the Institute for Administrative Offices of Higher Education, organized by the University of Chicago. Few universities demonstrated any major commitment to faculty preparatory programs. A 1949 conference on college teachers' preparation, chaired by the President of the University of Oregon, made recommendations to aid prospective college teachers. The 1930 Institute focused primarily on the professional preparation such as handling student problems, while the 1949 conference focused on pedagogical issues such as class loads and supervision. A 1956 conference sponsored by the American Council on Education emphasized knowledge of subject matter. The preparation of prospective college English teachers was addressed in a 1958 conference sponsored by four professional associations. All the conferences questioned whether the academic department or graduate school of education should be responsible for training prospective college teachers. In the 1960s more talk than action occurred concerning teacher training programs. Current training needs for prospective English teachers are identified. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

The materials in the Special Collection on the Training of Teaching Assistants were developed through the active efforts of numerous educators who first met at the 1986 National Conference on the Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants held at the Ohio State University. Assisted by more than 80 individuals, the committee chairs listed below were able to establish the collection which will be developed and maintained by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Higher Education. This arrangement will enable faculty members, faculty developers, administrators, TA supervisors, and graduate teaching assistants to have access to TA training materials produced by institutions across the nation.

Task Force on Establishing a National Clearinghouse of Materials Developed for TA Training

Chair: Jody Nyquist, University of Washington

Subcommittees

ERIC Collection Committee-

Chair: Margaret Pryately
University of Oklahoma

Council of Graduate Deans Clearinghouse -

Chair: Sheila Caskey
Southeast Missouri State University

Exploration of a Review Process -

Chair: Lynda Morton
University of Missouri

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education - Marilyn Shorr

Clearinghouse on ITA Materials - Janet Constantinides

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF
The Training of Teaching Assistants

Janet Marting
Department of English
University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

ED285511

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Marting

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Janet Marting
Department of English
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325

An Historical Overview of
the Training of Teaching Assistants

In 1980 Joyce Carroll wrote that "what is necessary for writing to improve...is a change to occur deep within the writing classroom. And this change must focus first on our greatest resource--the teacher" (70). Because teaching assistants have been and continue to be largely responsible for much of the teaching of freshman composition at many universities, the resource to which Carroll referred includes the graduate teaching assistant. According to John Wahlquist, teaching assistants are "de facto instructors" (44). He claims that "it is common knowledge that the traditional T.A.'s learn the practical tasks of instruction by trial and error" (44) and that because "much of the college instruction is done by graduate assistants, the improvement of college education in general depends upon their improvement" (44). Responsible to students, the department, the college and university, and in some people's estimation, to the fostering of a literate society, teaching assistants cannot be overlooked. Nor can their training be taken for granted.

As early as 1930, critics turned their attention to the preparation of college-level teachers, and in that year the Institute for Administrative Offices of Higher Institutions, organized by the University of Chicago, had as its central theme

"The Training of College Teachers." The papers read at the conference, and subsequently edited by William S. Gray, ranged from inquiries into weaknesses in college teaching and methods of training college teachers to sample preparatory programs at three universities (Woodward, 1). It is interesting to note that three years earlier in 1927, a Committee on the Professional Training of College Teachers stated that "'indifference in the need for such training is all but universal in the graduate schools.'" (Woodward, 1) During those three years, however, "there ... [were] heard from the general direction of the colleges low rumblings of discontent, ominous mutterings of dissatisfaction, savage growlings of complaint, accompanied by flashes of forked criticism directed immediately at the teaching capacity, or, to use the word of the critics, incapacity of the brilliantly hooded products of our graduate schools" (Laing, 51-2). Evidently, the dissatisfaction heard during those three years produced a need to attend to, if not remedy, the problem of college teacher training.

At the 1930 Institute, Henry Suzzallo cited three basic requirements for prospective college teachers: "civilized and cultured ... intellectual understandings and appreciations"; "more than ordinary mastery" of the content area; and specific mastery of "some of one subject or part of a subject" (20-3). While these requirements were said to have addressed the academic side of the prospective college teachers, other requirements were said to have fulfilled the professional side of the picture. Included in the professional requisites were an understanding of

the American educational system, knowledge of the psychology of learning, and supervised experience in the actual teaching of students (25-6). One notes with interest and amusement that the University of Iowa also required a physical examination of all graduate students, and if any "impediments or psychopathic tendencies" (Gray, 83) were displayed, the students would be discouraged from pursuing a teaching career. Of particular concern to the participants of the 1930 Institute and a concern which lasted for a number of years, however, was prospective teachers' actual experience in pedagogy.

Critics saw some sort of "professional training" necessary for prospective teachers, and in 1930 the most frequently cited training program consisted of a course on teaching methods conducted by a senior member of the department who was particularly interested in pedagogy. In that course, the prospective teachers, along with an experienced faculty member, discussed problems which might present themselves to beginning teachers. The other major recommendation of the Institute was for prospective teachers to enroll in an education course to learn about the developments in and the current state of education (Laing, 57-8). Hence, the responsibility for training college teachers was shared by the particular department of the prospective teachers and the school of education. One interesting remedy to the problem of preparing prospective teachers was offered by Ernest H. Wilings who saw the need to recruit more students of "high potential teaching ability" than the university had been doing, thus alleviating the need to rely

so heavily on training programs. To successfully accomplish such a goal, Wilkins also saw the need to make the field of teaching more appealing to prospective teachers, thereby encouraging graduate students with the most potential to pursue the teaching field (70).

Despite the rhetoric on what "should" be done to train and improve new teachers of college courses, and despite the findings of the 1930 Institute, few universities demonstrated any appreciable commitment to preparatory programs. Columbia University officials, for example, stated that their university had no general program for preparing prospective college teachers, nor did it have any plans to institute one (Gray, 218). Harvard College officials had no program to aid prospective teachers, and thought that one was not critically needed because, in their estimation, prospective teachers could learn the most from observing their own successful professors. Moreover, Harvard officials felt that graduate students should teach in their specializations or where their strengths lay, and not necessarily in low-division courses for which they were frequently unprepared. Because of such thinking, graduate students would naturally be prepared for their teaching duties and would not need a training program (Gray, 221-2). The University of Iowa's graduate students entered the university with certifications in education and, therefore, were considered knowledgeable in teaching. Although Iowa urged its students to attend departmental seminars in teaching, the university required

only physical examinations of students, and speech tests and coaching when needed (Gray, 224-5).

In short, while many of the universities surveyed by the Institute recognized and acknowledged the need for training programs--or at least for prospective college teachers to be trained--few had made a concerted commitment to providing them for their graduate students. And if any commitment was made, it took the form of one seminar, non-compulsary supervision of senior faculty as well as a recommendation for prospective teachers to study the state of education through the education department.

As is the case with trends in education, the issue of college teacher preparation received renewed attention almost twenty years after the Institute. This time, a report of a 1949 conference on college teachers' preparation, chaired by O. Meredith Wilson, President of the University of Oregon, noted that in spite of the lipservice paid and minor gestures offered to alleviate the problem, few schools had made an active commitment to helping college teachers prepare for their jobs; rather, it was concluded, the attention to preparatory programs was expressed by a few interested professors, with little consistent or ongoing support and involvement evident from the rest of the department or university community (Wise, 77).

While the 1949 conference participants noted that graduate schools were concerned with turning out qualified teachers, they found that the overwhelming sentiment was for graduate schools to produce the learned scholar, and only secondarily the

accomplished teacher. Hence, one discovers some rationale for graduate schools' lack of commitment to supporting strong and active preparatory programs for their prospective college teachers.

Finally at the 1949 conference, questions were raised concerning the professional needs that graduate schools would better serve. Among those questions or concerns were the fostering of individual teaching styles of prospective college teachers, prospective teachers' understanding of their students' motivations for learning, the content or subject matter of doctoral work becoming broad enough to help new teachers, and, most germane to the discussion of training programs, an inquiry into the extent to which graduate students are prepared by the universities to become the best teachers possible (Wise, 78-80).

The recommendations made or the issues cited as needing continued support from graduate schools included assigning reduced teaching loads to new teachers, requiring new teachers to work under the supervision of experienced professors, providing new teachers with a diverse range of teaching experiences, monitoring new teachers' responsibilities from initial observation of classes to assuming full responsibility for teaching, and providing new teachers with seminars and workshops on teaching to be conducted by superior faculty members (Wise, 88). Thus, the 1949 conference, more so than the 1930 Institute, generated not only specific areas of concern but, more importantly, remedies or recommendations to aid prospective college teachers. It should be noted that these recommendations,

over thirty years old, are now the ones most frequently adopted in graduate teaching assistant programs in universities, especially in departments of English.

Almost a decade elapsed before two more conferences on college teacher preparation were held and a renewed commitment to the area was demonstrated. In its discussion of pertinent issues in academia, the American Council on Education's January 1956 conference, whose proceedings were published in 1958, included inquiries into masters and doctoral programs as well as graduate study's commitment to preparing prospective college teachers. Like the 1930 Institute, attention was given to several programs in college teacher training at universities. The participants of this 1956 conference, however, disagreed on the kind of pedagogical training needed to prepare prospective teachers. Nonetheless, they did reach concensus that some sort of training was necessary, and that requiring graduate students to take a course in college teaching was insufficient to the demands of real teacher training (English Journal, 537-47).

The most significant issue raised at the American Council on Education's conference was the long overlooked distinction in teacher training programs between the prospective teachers' mastery of course work (content or subject matter) and the methods of teaching that content or subject matter. While the 1930 Institute had focused primarily on the professional preparation of prospective college teachers (e.g. handling student problems and becoming bone fide members of the profession) and the 1949 conference had focused on pedagogical

issues (e.g. class loads and the supervision of new teachers' classes), all of the conferees at these two conferences had failed to talk specifically about the prospective teachers' mastery of the material they were to teach as an important feature of college teacher training. In reporting on the proceedings of the 1956 conference, Joseph Axelrod noted that the participants agreed that "two obvious fallacies are to be avoided: the assumption that such preparation [college teachers'] is exclusively a matter of content preparation, and the assumption that pedagogical competence can serve as a substitute for scholarly knowledge" (1-3, 95). Thus, under examination at the 1956 conference were not the methods behind teaching (pedagogy) as much as the knowledge of subject matter required of college teachers that informs what will happen pedagogically--the distinction between the knowledge of course material and the presentation of that course material to students, with the 1956 conference addressing the former.

Held in 1958 under the auspices of the American Studies Association, the College English Association, the Modern Language Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English, the Basic Issues Conference posed thirty-five issues which the participants deemed worthy of investigation, and of those thirty-five, seventeen dealt with the preparation or training of prospective English teachers. Hence, the concerns of the 1930, 1949, and 1956 conferences received renewed attention. Of the issues germane to teaching at the college level, the committee asked "What preparation for college teaching should the Ph.D.

candidate receive?" and "How can we achieve articulation of teaching and teacher training at all levels in English?" (Axelrod, 95). While the issue of teacher training for prospective college teachers was not a major consideration at the Basic Issues Conference, it was given some attention, and suggests that while previous conferences had focused on college teacher preparation, the area was still open for further consideration; no hard and fast conclusions had been reached in almost thirty years of discussion.

Perhaps the one issue that united all of the conferences on teacher training for the college level was the question of whose responsibility it was to train prospective college teachers. There appears to be consensus on this question, and the answer, according to a number of critics in recent years, rests with the individual academic departments, and not with the graduate school or department of education. In The Miseducation of American Teachers, in 1963, for instance, James D. Koerner wrote that the "academic departments must accept major responsibility both for the present state of teacher education and for affecting improvements" (263). The conclusion of a program for college teacher training at the University of Michigan during 1967 and 1971 was that "a move toward active departmental responsibility for preparation of college teachers was gaining momentum. More time and resources are being devoted to this responsibility" (Stockdale, Wochok, 90). While the Michigan program involved the departments of botony, history, philosophy, physics, and psychology, it appears that English departments are not exempt

from similar commitments to college teacher preparation. In his article "How the Candidate Learns to Teach College English," for example, Warner G. Rice made just that claim: "If, then, departments of English think that college teaching is important, they must accept the obligation for providing a more thorough discipline in the art than they have attempted in the past" (583).

Certainly one of the most damning and inflammatory commentaries on the issue of responsibility for college teachers' training also came in 1963 from Albert R. Kitzhaber:

...much of the poor teaching that one so often finds in freshman English is less the result of inexperience and indifference than of inadequate professional preparation--as indeed it is in the high schools also. The blame for this state of affairs must rest squarely with the college departments of English that have given these teachers their undergraduate and graduate education. (15)

Kitzhaber cited the English curriculum's reliance on the study of literature (and not on writing and its teaching) as the culprit. Despite the interest and care that prospective college teachers bring to their own classes, such qualities, according to Kitzhaber, do not take the place of training or preparatory programs. Good intentions and hard work, while complementary to, are no substitute for training in the teaching of college English. Commenting on the need for teacher preparation, one critic noted, "...all the high-priced texts and high-powered materials will not replace a well-prepared teacher" (Carroll, 7).

It is interesting to note that the early to mid-1960's produced a tremendous amount of interest in the training of

college English teachers. In 1963, for example, Alfred H. Grommon edited The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges. Also in that year, Albert R. Kitzhaber's Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College appeared. Two years later, in 1965, John C. Gerber edited The College Teaching of English. Clearly, critics in the field of English were concerned with how English might best be taught at the college level and how prospective teachers might be trained to become effective college writing teachers.

Despite the 1960's interest in the training of prospective English teachers and the call for English departments to shoulder the responsibility of preparatory programs, Ann M. Heiss reported in 1970 that "in half of the fifty institutions which produced 90 per cent of the Ph.D.'s each year, [training] program[s] for teaching assistants had remained substantially unchanged during the past decade or more" (231). Thus, from the 1960's call to prepare future college teachers to 1970, more talk than action had been given to training programs. Despite the call for individual departments to be responsible for training their graduate students how to teach, less than full and active commitment was being given to preparing prospective college teachers for their new role.

Addressing the issue of teaching assistants and training programs during a panel discussion, Edgar W. Lacy contended that "The system of using graduate students to teach freshmen can be regarded as functioning satisfactorily..." (36). However, Lacy was quick to add that one of the "safeguards" was that the

teaching assistant "must not be asked to do more than he has experience to do" (36). Twenty years later, in 1974, Maxine Hairston amplified Lacy's stance when she wrote that "In many ways, Teaching Assistants may do a better job of teaching freshmen than some of our senior colleagues. They will do a good job, however, only if we have effective ways to train them and to supervise them during the first years of their apprenticeship in the profession" (52). National English conferences such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication have included in their programs entire sessions which addressed the training of teaching assistants and ways to help them become successful college writing teachers. Such conferences, it is important to note, come twenty years after a 1959-60 survey on the issue of college teacher training which reported that "'If there is a grave lack... it is in the production of teachers of freshman composition who are specifically trained and psychologically conditioned to perform with enthusiasm and real distinction'" (Gorrell, 113-4).

Because of the need for well-trained college writing teachers and the plethora of research now emerging on the writing process and the most effective ways to teach college writing, the issue of preparatory programs continues to be a concern among directors of Composition programs, English professors, and university administrators. The issue of college teacher training--at least in English departments and writing programs--has received more than lipservice, and has not been relegated to

the departments of education or graduate schools as it had been in the past.

Increased interest in and knowledge of writing theory and pedagogy has determined the ways in which to best prepare prospective writing teachers. From the 1930 Institute's focus on teaching methods and educational history to the 1949 conference which debated the scholar versus the practitioner to the 1956 conference on mastery of course work and methods of teaching to the 1960's pointing to the culprits of inadequate teacher preparation, we now discover that newfound understandings and appreciation of the composing process dictate the content of training programs in composition for teaching assistants: We now must address the writer in the teacher, the composing process, ways that composition theory and research can find a home in the classroom or be translated into practice.

Because of this, training programs for teaching assistants have begun to succeed because some universities have done more than merely acknowledge composition in the academy. Some have done more than provide TA's with a crash course in the history of education; some have done more than "ease" TA's into their responsibilities; and some have done more than fall into the quicksand of politics, to emerge still discussing whose responsibility it is to train teachers. Rather, some schools have finally begun to engage TA's in a program of writing themselves as well as a discussion of writing theory and its implications for classroom practice; some have begun to use the resources available to us, and have seen them implemented in the

classroom. Graduate students, once required to take the perfunctory Practicum in the teaching of college composition, are finding composition a rich field--and certainly one they need preparation in if they are to be viable job candidates and effective teachers. Training programs have also given rise to increased enrollments in composition theory courses and master's theses in composition, both of which extend teachers' knowledge of composition and its teaching. In short, the redefinition of composition and its place in the college curriculum has helped in beginning to put the teaching of writing in its rightful place. The change to which Carroll referred is being felt by those willing to abandon the politics, fear, and disdain associated with the importance and emergence of composition in the curriculum. Finally, scholarship and pedagogy have begun to shake hands. And for that, not only have our TA's--but their students--become the benefactors.

Notes

- Axelrod, Joseph. Graduate Study for Future College Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.
- Carroll, Joyce. "Process, Praxis, and A Writing Project." Texas Writers Newsletter 26(1980): 7.
- English Journal, 57(1968): 537-547.
- Gorrell, Robert M. "Freshman Composition." The College Teaching of English, ed. John C. Gerber, New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1965: 113-114.
- Hairston, Maxine. "Training Teaching Assistants in English." College Composition and Communication 5(1954): 36.
- Heiss, Ann M. Challenges to Graduate Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970: 231.
- Kitzhaber, Albert R. Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.
- Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.
- Lacy, Edgar W. "The Graduate Assistant and the Freshman English Student: A Panel Discussion." College Composition and Communication, 5(1954): 36.
- Laing, Gordon J. "The Newer Educational Program and the Training of Teachers." The Training of College Teachers. Ed. William S. Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930: 51-52.
- "Reports on Current Methods of Training College Teachers in Various Higher Institutions." The Training of College Teachers. Ed. William S. Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930: 218.
- Rice, Warner G. "How the Candidate Learns to Teach College English." The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges. Ed. Alfred H. Grommon. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963: 583.
- Suzzallo, Henry. "Academic and Professional Elements in the Training of Prospective College Teachers." The Training of College Teachers. Ed. William S. Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930: 20-23.
- Wahlquist, John T. Innovations in the Preparation of College Teachers. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970.

Wise, W. Max. "Who Teaches the Teachers?" Improving College Teaching. Ed. Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967: 77.

Woodward, Frederic. "The Problem of the Institute." The Training of College Teachers. Ed. William S. Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930: 1.